



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

ew

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/040,539 03/17/98 YOSHIDA

A JA997028

D J KAPPOS
IBM CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
555 BAILEY AVENUE
SAN JOSE CA 95141

LM02/0721

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2773

DATE MAILED:

07/21/99

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/040,539

Applicant(s)
AKIRA YOSHIDA

Examiner
Aktar Hossain

Group Art Unit
2773



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 17, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 6

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2773

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 10, line 1: "Fig 3" should be changed to Fig. 3A-C. Appropriate correction is required.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed Docu P l u s V 1.0 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56© most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each document listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2773

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,263,134 issued to Paal et al.

I. Per Claim 1

Paal discloses:

A- “ a first sub-screen displaying a first area of image data; a main screen displaying a part of said first area with enlargement” (col 16, lines 43 - 49).

B- “ a first sub-screen image window for displaying an area displayed in said main screen with a display indicating frame on said first sub-screen “ (col 4, lines 8 -14).

Paal et al. failed to clearly teach “ a second sub-screen displaying a second area which is adjacent to said first area; and

a second sub-screen image window for displaying said display indicating frame in said second sub-screen when said pointing device has moved said display indicating frame by dragging it into said second sub-screen”.

However, Paal et al. disclosed that available information comprise a stack of notecards (col. 3, lines 65- 67) or a complete document (col 4, lines 53 - 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention, to implement the display of a second notecard or a second portion of the document, adjacent to the first notecard or first portion of the document. Motivation of the implementation is for simoustanously viewing information of the two cards or the two portions of the documents.

II. Per Claim 2

Art Unit: 2773

Paal discloses:

A- “ a first sub-screen displaying a first area of image data in a sub-screen column; a main screen displaying a part of said first area with enlargement” (col 16, lines 43 - 49).

B- “ a first sub-screen image window for displaying a reduced image of a page which is currently displayed on said main screen with said area displayed in said main screen indicated by a display indicating frame” (col 4, lines 8 - 14).

Paal et al. failed to clearly teach “ a second sub-screen displaying in said sub-screen column a second area which is adjacent to said first area; and

a second sub-screen image window for displaying said display indicating frame in said second sub-screen when said pointing device has moved said display indicating frame by dragging it into said second sub-screen;

a display screen parent window operative when said pointing device has dropped said display indicating frame at an arbitrary place on said second screen to which said pointing device moved, for switching said main screen to the page to which said pointing device moved and displaying the place indicated by said display indicating frame in said main screen”.

However, Paal et al. disclosed that available information comprise a stack of notecards (col. 3, lines 65 - 67) or a complete document (col 4, lines 53 - 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, to implement the display of a second notecard or a second portion of the document, adjacent to the

Art Unit: 2773

first notecard or first portion of the document. Motivation of the implementation is for simultaneously viewing information of the two cards or the two portions of the documents.

III. Per Claim 3

Paal discloses:

“ sub-screen parent window scrolls said sub-screen so that the sub-screen of the page displayed on said main screen comes to substantially the central position of said sub-screen column” (Fig. 1).

IV. Per Claim 4

Paal discloses:

“ displaying an area displayed in said main screen with a display indicating frame on said first sub-screen” (col 4, lines 8 -14).

Paal et al. failed to clearly teach “displaying said display indicating frame in said second sub-screen when said pointing device has moved said display indicating frame by dragging it into said second sub-screen”.

However, Paal et al. disclosed that available information comprise a stack of notecards (col. 3, lines 65 - 67) or a complete document (col 4, lines 53 - 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention, to implement the display of a second notecard or a second portion of the document, adjacent to the

Art Unit: 2773

first notecard or first portion of the document. Motivation of the implementation is for simultaneously viewing information of the two cards or the two portions of the documents.

V. Per Claim 5

Paal discloses:

“ displaying a reduced image of a page which is currently displayed on said main screen with the area displayed in said main screen indicated by a display indicating frame “ (col 4, lines 8 -14).

Paal et al. failed to clearly teach “displaying said display indicating frame in said second sub-screen when said pointing device has moved said display indicating frame by dragging it into said second sub-screen;

switching said main screen to the page to which said pointing device moved to display the place indicated by said display indicating frame in said main screen when said pointing device has dropped said display indicating frame at an arbitrary place on said second screen to which the pointing device moved to display the place indicated by said display indicating frame in said main screen ”.

However, Paal et al. disclosed that available information comprise a stack of notecards (col. 3, lines 65 - 67) or a complete document (col 4, lines 53 - 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention, to implement the display of a second notecard or a second portion of the document, adjacent to the

Art Unit: 2773

first notecard or first portion of the document. Motivation of the implementation is for simultaneously viewing information of the two cards or the two portions of the documents.

VI. Per Claim 6

Paal discloses:

A- “display a first sub-screen displaying a first area of image data; display a main screen displaying a part of said first area with enlargement” (col 16, lines 43 - 49).

B- “display the area displayed in said main screen on said first sub-screen with a display indicating frame (col 4, lines 8-14).

Paal et al. failed to clearly teach “display a second sub-screen displaying a second area which is adjacent to said first area; and

display said display indicating frame in said second sub-screen when said pointing device has moved said display indicating frame by dragging it into said second sub-screen”.

However, Paal et al. disclosed that available information comprise a stack of notecards (col. 3, lines 65 - 67) or a complete document (col 4, lines 53 - 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention, to implement the display of a second notecard or a second portion of the document, adjacent to the first notecard or first portion of the document. Motivation of the implementation is for simultaneously viewing information of the two cards or the two portions of the documents.

VII. Per Claim 7

Paal discloses:

Art Unit: 2773

A- “ display a main screen displaying a part of a page with enlargement;
display first sub-screen displaying the image of that page in a sub-screen column” (col
16, lines 43 - 49).

B- “ display a reduced image of a page which is currently displayed on said main
screen with the area displayed in said main screen indicated by a display indicating frame ” (col
4, lines 8-14).

Paal et al. failed to clearly teach “ display a second sub-screen displaying one or more
second areas which is adjacent to said page in said sub-screen column;

display said display indicating frame in said second sub-screen when said pointing device
has moved said display indicating frame by dragging it into said second sub-screen;

switching said sub-screen to the page to which said pointing device moved to display the
place indicated by said display indicating frame in said main screen, when said pointing device
has dropped said display indicating frame at an arbitrary place on said second screen to which
said pointing device moved ”.

However, Paal et al. disclosed that available information comprise a stack of notecards (col. 3, lines 65 - 67) or a complete document (col 4, lines 53 - 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention, to implement the display of a second notecard or a second portion of the document, adjacent to the first notecard or first portion of the document. Motivation of the implementation is for simoustanously viewing information of the two cards or the two portions of the documents.

Art Unit: 2773

Contact Information


Response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks , Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 308-9051 may be used for formal communications or (703) 308-6606 for informal or draft communications. Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document. Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Aktar Hossain, whose telephone number is (703) 306-5541. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 8: 00 - 3:00 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim, can be reached at (703) 305-3821.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Aktar Hossain

July 19, 1999


BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/18/99